



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/575,294

10/05/2007

Colleen Brophy

097598-0211

3701

48329 7590 09/24/2010

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
111 HUNTINGTON AVENUE
26TH FLOOR
BOSTON, MA 02199-7610

EXAMINER

GUPTA, ANISH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1654

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/24/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/575,294	Applicant(s) BROPHY ET AL.	
	Examiner ANISH GUPTA	Art Unit 1654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/12/2006; 7/12/07; 7/20/2010</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Art Unit: 1654

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Groups 1, claim(s) 1-2, drawn to compositing comprising a peptide of formula I.

Group 2, claim(s) 3-5, drawn to nucleic acid sequences.

Group 3, claim(s) 6, drawn to biomedical device.

Group 4, claim(s) 7, drawn to method of using the peptide.

The groups of inventions listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The MPEP states “[i]f, however, an independent claim does not avoid the prior art, then the question whether there is still an inventive link between all the claims dependent on that claim needs to be carefully considered. If there is no link remaining, an objection of lack of unity a posteriori (that is, arising only after assessment of the prior art) may be raised. Similar considerations apply in the case of a genus/species or combination/subcombination situation.” Here, claim 1 does not avoid prior art as evidenced by JP2001278894 and discussed below.

During a telephone conversation with Steve Davis on Sept. 9, 2010 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-2. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 3-7 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently

Art Unit: 1654

named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Uematsu (JP2001278894).

The claims are drawn to a peptide of the formula X1-X2-X3.

The reference teaches numerous peptides that are used in medicinal composition.

Specifically, the reference teaches peptide of the sequence WLRRAS (see paragraph [0013]). This meets the limitation of the claims when X1 and X3 are absent, Z3 is Serine residue, and u is 1. The reference anticipates the claimed invention.

2. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brophy (US20030060399 or US7135453)

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that

Art Unit: 1654

any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention “by another,” or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

The claims are drawn to a peptide of the formula X1-X2-X3.

The reference teaches peptides of the sequence X1-X2-[X3-A(X4)APLP-X5-]n-X6, where X1 is absent or an aromatic ring, X2 is absent or a transduction domain, X3 the sequence WLRR, X4 is S, T, Y, D, E, X5 is 0-3 amino acids, X6 is a transduction domain (see claim 1). The reference specifically teach numerous sequences that contain the sequence WLRRASAPLP (see pages 5-6). For example, the reference teaches the sequence WLRRASAPLP (see paragraph [0072]). Note that these sequences are specifically contemplated in the larger sequence above. The reference teaches that the peptides can be used to treat numerous disorders and discloses pharmaceutical formulations (see page 8). The reference anticipates the claimed invention.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686

Art Unit: 1654

F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-2 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-39 of U.S. Patent No. 7,135,453. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following reasons.

The claims are drawn to a peptide of the formula X1-X2-X3.

The US patent claims peptides of the sequence X1-X2-[X3-A(X4)APLP-X5-]n-X6, where X1 is absent or an aromatic ring, X2 is absent or a transduction domain, X3 the sequence WLRR, X4 is S, T, Y, D, E, X5 is 0-3 amino acids, X6 is a transduction domain (see claim 1). The patent specifically claims X3 to be of the sequence WLRR (see claim 19) and X4 as S (see claim 18). Thus, the sequence claimed in the patent includes WLRRASAPLP. Note that while the US patent disclose a sequence that different from the claimed sequence in the addition of Lue and Pro at the terminal end, they still read on the instant claim since the instant claim do not utilize closed language for define X2. Since the US patent claims methods of treating disorders, in practicing the claimed method, one would have to utilize pharmaceutical formulations of the claimed peptides. Thus, the US Patent and the instant claims are not patentably distinct from each other.

4. Claims 1-2 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1-39 of commonly assigned US 7135453. Specifically, for the reasons set forth above.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP Chapter 2300). Commonly assigned 7135453, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications pending on or after December 10, 2004.

5. Claims 1-2 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of U.S. Patent No. 7,381,699. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following reasons.

The claims are drawn to a peptide of the formula X1-X2-X3.

The US patent claims peptides of the sequence X1-X2-[X3-A(X4)APLP-X5-]n-X6, where X1 is absent or an aromatic ring, X2 is absent or a transduction domain, X3 the sequence WLRR,

Art Unit: 1654

X4 is S, T, Y, D, E, X5 is 0-3 amino acids, X6 is a transduction domain (see claim 1). Thus, the sequence claimed in the patent includes WLRRASAPLP. Note that while the US patent disclose a sequence that different from the claimed sequence in the addition of Lue and Pro at the terminal end, they still read on the instant claim since the instant claim do not utilize closed language for define X2. Thus, the US Patent and the instant claims are not patentably distinct from each other.

6. Claims 1-2 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1-39 of commonly assigned US 71381699. Specifically, for the reasons set forth above.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP Chapter 2300). Commonly assigned 71381699, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications pending on or after December 10, 2004.

Art Unit: 1654

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANISH GUPTA whose telephone number is (571)272-0965.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tsang Cecilia can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Anish Gupta/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1654